

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated January 7, 2008, claims 85, 86, 88-93, and 115-116 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a). In this Response, Applicants have canceled claim 92 and added claims 117-131. Accordingly, claims 85, 86, 88-91, 93, and 115-131 will be pending after entry of this Amendment.

I. Rejections under U.S.C. 103

In the Office Action, claims 85, 86, 88, and 115-116 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,751,402 (hereinafter referred to as Elliot), in view of US Patent 6,901,603 (hereinafter referred to as Zeidler), in further view of US Patent 6,038,614 (hereinafter referred to as Chan), claim 89 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliot, in view of Zeidler, in further view of Chan, in further view of US Patent 6,353,700 (hereinafter referred to as Zhou), rejected claim 90 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliot, in view of Zeidler, in further view of Chan, in further view of US Patent 6,826,512 (hereinafter referred to as Dara-Abrams), rejected claim 91 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliot, in view of Zeidler, in further view of Chan, in further view of US Patent 5,793,366 (hereinafter referred to as Mano), rejected claim 92 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliot, in view of Zeidler, in further view of Chan, in further view of US Patent Publication 2002/0059588 (hereinafter referred to as Huber), and rejected claim 93 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliot, in view of Zeidler, in further view of Chan, in further view of US Patent 5,883,621 (hereinafter referred to as Iwamura).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Claim 85 recites a home media system comprising:

network;
 acquisition storage set-top box, coupled to said network, for storing a plurality of different types of executable files, the executable files comprising video, audio, and image files ;
 control/playback set-top box, coupled to said network, comprising a media playback module and a media control module, said media control module for accessing, across said network, at least one executable file from said acquisition storage set-top box, and for running at least one of a plurality of media applications that provide functionality, through a user interface, to play media, said plurality of media applications comprising a video application for playing video media, an audio application for playing audio media, and a photo application for viewing image media, said media playback module for executing said executable file; and
 plurality of client devices, coupled to said control/playback set-top box, the plurality of client devices comprising a display client device for displaying said user interface for said media application and for displaying video or image media and an audio client device for playing audio media.
 [Emphasis added.]

Applicants submit that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each limitation of claim 85. For example, Elliot does not teach or suggest an acquisition storage set-top box for storing a plurality of different types of executable files, and a media playback module for executing an executable file.

The Examiner indicates that Elliot discloses an acquisition storage set-top box (personal video recorder 200 of Figure 2) coupled to a network for storing an executable file (video streams 222 and 223 of Figure 3). The Examiner further indicates that Elliot discloses a control/playback set-top box (set-top box 100) coupled to a network, the control/playback set-top box comprising a media playback module (video output interface 120) and a media control module (microprocessor 140).

As well known in the art, a video stream is not equivalent to an executable file. As well known in the art, an executable file comprises executable code or instructions while a video stream does not contain executable code or instructions. Also, nowhere in Elliot is it taught or suggested that the video streams 222 and 223 comprise executable code or instructions. Elliot also discusses DTLA ("Digital Transmission Licensing Administrator"), but states that DTLA provides copying protection using authentication by key exchange and does not teach or suggest the use of executable files in providing copy protection (see Elliot, column 6, lines 8-21). Since Elliot does not teach or suggest an executable file, Elliot also does not teach or suggest a media playback module for executing an executable file.

For the above reasons, Applicants submit that claim 85 is in allowable form. Claims 86, 88-91, 93, and 115-116 are dependent upon claim 85, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 85.

II. New Claims

New claims 117-131 have been added. New independent claim 117 recites a home media system comprising:

- home network;
- coupled to said home network, a storage set-top box configured for storing a plurality of different types of media objects comprising video, audio, and image objects comprising media;
- coupled to said home network, a control/playback set-top box configured for:
 - providing a plurality of media applications comprising a video application for video objects, an audio application for audio objects, and a photo application for image objects;
 - receiving a first request from a first user for a first media object, retrieving, across said home network, said first media object from said storage set-top box, running a first media

application suitable for said type of said first media object, and playing first media in said first media object; and

receiving a second request from a second user for a second media object, retrieving, across said home network, said second media object from said storage set-top box, running a second media application suitable for said type of said second media object, and playing second media in said second media object, wherein said first and second media applications are run simultaneously and said first and second media are played simultaneously; and

coupled to said control/playback set-top box, a plurality of client devices comprising a first client device for presenting first media in said first media object to said first user and a second client device for presenting second media in said second media object to said second user, wherein said first and second media are presented simultaneously.

[Emphasis added.]

Applicants submit that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each limitation of claim 117. For example, the cited references do not teach or suggest first and second media applications that are run simultaneously, first and second media that are played simultaneously, and presenting first media in a first media object to a first user and presenting second media in a second media object to a second user, wherein said first and second media are presented simultaneously.

For the above reasons, Applicants submit that claim 117 is in allowable form. New claims 118-119 are dependent upon claim 117, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 117.

New independent claim 120 recites a home media system comprising:

home network;

coupled to said home network, a plurality of media devices containing a plurality of different types of media objects comprising media, said plurality of media devices comprising a video device containing video objects, an audio device containing audio objects, and an image device containing image objects;

coupled to said home network, a storage set-top box configured for:

acquiring a plurality of different types of media objects comprising video, audio, and image objects from the plurality of media devices;

storing the plurality of different types of media objects; and organizing the plurality of different types of media objects based on the type of media object; and

coupled to said home network, a control/playback set-top box configured for:

retrieving, across said home network, media objects from said storage set-top box; and
playing said media in said retrieved media objects; and

coupled to said control/playback set-top box, a plurality of client devices for presenting said media in said media objects.

[Emphasis added.]

Applicants submit that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each limitation of claim 120. For example, the cited references do not teach or suggest a plurality of media devices comprising a video device containing video objects, an audio device containing audio objects, and an image device containing image objects, and a storage set-top box configured for acquiring a plurality of different types of media objects from the plurality of media devices and organizing the plurality of different types of media objects based on the type of media object.

For the above reasons, Applicants submit that claim 120 is in allowable form. New claims 121-131 are dependent upon claim 120, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 120.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER | SUH PC

Dated: May 7, 2008

/s/ Gregory Suh/ #48,187

Gregory Suh
Reg. No. 48,187

Stattler | Suh PC
60 South Market Street
Suite 480
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 881-0140 ext. 104
(408) 881-0145 (Fax)